

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

OA NO. 1600/91,
RA No. 38/92

.. Date of decision: 30.7.1992

Sh. M.K. Goyal

.. Applicant

Sh. M.K. Gupta

.. Counsel for the applicant

Versus

U.O.I.

.. Respondents.

Sh. P.H. Ramchandani

.. Counsel for the respondents

CORAM

Hon'ble Sh. P.K. Kartha, Vice Chairman (J)

Hon'ble Sh. B.N. Dhoundiyal, Member (A)

JUDGEMENT (Oral)

We have heard the learned counsel for both parties. on RA 38/92. Both sides agreed that the Judgement of the Tribunal dated 24.1.1992 has been fully complied with and that the necessary orders have been issued by the respondents. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner drew our attention to para 7 of the judgement in which a typographical error has occurred -

"Respondent No. 2(C.A.T.) has been directed to re-fix the pay of the applicant".

Reference to Respondent No.2 is to the Central Board of Excise and Customs and not to the C.A.T. The typographical error has been corrected in the original copy of the judgement.

RA is disposed of accordingly.

(B.N. Dhoundiyal)

Member(A)

(P.K. Kartha)

Vice Chairman (J)